## Case 2:19-cv-02676-NIQA Document 1 Filed 06/19/19 Page 1 of 12

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

parpose or minaring the errir c										
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Vincent M. Gasper				DEFENDANTS Schulson Collective, LLC and Michael Schulson						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Fernando I. Rivera, Esqu 1525 Locust Street, 9th (215) 545-7676	uire, Console Mattiacc	i Law, LLC		Attorneys (If Known,	)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIP	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box j	for Plainti,	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	· ·				PTF DEF	Incorporated or Proof Business In		or Defende PTF 4	ant) DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	nip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	0 2 0 2	Incorporated and of Business In		<b>□</b> 5	□ 5	
				•	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		<b>□</b> 6	□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	FO	Foreign Country  Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.								
CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY							OTHER	STATUT	ES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel & Slander  330 Federal Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury  360 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice  CIVIL RIGHTS  440 Other Civil Rights  441 Voting  442 Employment  443 Housing/	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  385 Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	72	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other  LABOR  Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act	423 Withdrawal		□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision			
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations  Accommodations  445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other  448 Education	☐ 530 General		IMMIGRATION  2 Naturalization Application  5 Other Immigration  Actions			950 Constitu State Sta	tionality o	f	
	m One Box Only) moved from	Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop	1141131	erred from er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	ı <b>-</b>	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fil	n -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. ( Brief description of ca	stute under which you ar "FLSA"), the Pennsylvania suse: on against Defendants for fai	Minimum	Wage Act, 43 P.S. § 330.1	01 et seq. ("Pi	MWA"), and Pennsyl	Ivania common lav	w		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			<u> </u>			y if demanded in complaint:  D: ▼ Yes □ No				
VIII. RELATED CASE		JUDGE				ET NUMBER				
DATE			ORNEY O	F RECORD						
06/19/2019 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		Whi		-						
	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP			JUDGE		MAG. JUDGE				

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

VINCENT M. GASPER

Huntingdon Valley, PA

Plaintiff,

v. : CIVIL ACTION NO.

SCHULSON COLLECTIVE, LLC

1525 Sansom Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl. Philadelphia, PA 19107

and

MICHAEL SCHULSON 1525 Sansom Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl. Philadelphia, PA 19107

Defendants. : JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

#### **COMPLAINT**

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, Vincent M. Gasper ("Plaintiff"), brings this action against his former employer Defendant, Schulson Collective, LLC ("Schulson Collective"), and Michael Schulson ("Schulson") (collectively, "Defendants"). Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff for overtime hours worked in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. ("FLSA"), the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act, 43 P.S. § 330.101 et seq. ("PMWA"), and Pennsylvania common law. Plaintiff seeks all damages allowable under the law.

#### II. PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff is an individual and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 2. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a "non-exempt employee" within the meaning

of the FLSA and PMWA.

- 3. Defendant Schulson Collective is a corporation formed under the laws of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 4. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson Collective was an "employer" and covered entity within the meaning of the FLSA and the PMWA.
- 5. Defendant Schulson is an individual and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 6. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson was Defendant Schulson Collective's Owner and Chief Executive Officer (CEO).
- 7. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson was an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA and the PMWA, and had oversight and discretion with regards to the payment of Plaintiff's wages, including overtime compensation, and made decisions concerning Defendant Schulson Collective's day-to-day operations, hiring, firing, promotions, personnel matters, work schedules, pay policies, and compensation.
- 8. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson directly or indirectly, directed, aided, abetted, and/or assisted with the creation and/or execution of policies or practices of Defendant Schulson Collective, which resulted in the failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation.
- 9. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson had control over approving the payment of overtime compensation and/or processing payroll relative to Plaintiff.
- 10. At all relevant times, Defendant Schulson Collective acted by and through Defendant Schulson and its other agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendant Schulson Collective.

#### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. The causes of action that form the bases of this matter arise under the FLSA, the PMWA, and Pennsylvania common law unjust enrichment.
- 12. The District Court has jurisdiction over Counts I and II (FLSA) pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 210 et seq., U.S.C. § 216, and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 13. The District Court has supplement jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims arising under the PMWA (Counts III and IV) and Pennsylvania common law (Count V) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
- 14. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(l) and (b)(2) in that Defendants reside in this district and all or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this district.

#### IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Plaintiff began working for Defendants on or around July 5, 2016, and his last day of employment was on or around August 9, 2018.
- 16. During the course of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, he worked as a Facilities Director reporting directly to Defendant Schulson, Owner and CEO.
- 17. At all relevant times, while a Facilities Director, Plaintiff did not possess managerial responsibility, such as control over scheduling, hiring or firing authority.
- 18. At all relevant times, while a Facilities Director, Plaintiff did not customarily and regularly direct the work of two or more other employees of Defendants.
- 19. Between July 5, 2016 and June of 2017, Defendants misclassified Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee for overtime purposes and paid him an annual salary of \$65,000 for all hours worked, including all hours worked in excess of forty hours in a given workweek.

- 20. Between July 5, 2016 and June of 2017, although Plaintiff typically and regularly worked in excess of a forty-hour workweek during the majority of those weeks, Plaintiff was not compensated for any hours worked in excess of the forty hours in a given workweek.
- 21. Between July of 2017 and his separation from employment, Defendants misclassified Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee for overtime purposes and paid him an annual salary of \$72,500 for all hours worked, including all hours worked in excess of forty hours in a given workweek.
- 22. Between July of 2017 and his separation from employment, although Plaintiff typically and regularly worked in excess of a forty-hour workweek during the majority of those weeks, Plaintiff was not compensated for any hours worked in excess of the forty hours in a given workweek.
- 23. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Defendants typically and regularly required Plaintiff to work more than forty-hours per workweek at the request and benefit of Defendants without paying him any additional compensation.
- 24. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was required to perform work on non-work related projects at Defendant Schulson's home for his personal benefit without paying Plaintiff any additional compensation.
- 25. Despite actual knowledge of the hours worked by Plaintiff, Defendants willfully failed to pay or approve proper overtime compensation and thus, recklessly disregarded the fact that their conduct was unlawful.
- 26. By misclassifying Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee for overtime purposes, Defendants knowingly misled Plaintiff to believe that he was ineligible for overtime compensation for his hours worked in excess of forty hours in a given workweek.

27. To avoid compensating Plaintiff for his overtime work, Defendants misclassified him as a non-exempt employee and under compensated Plaintiff for all overtime hours worked between July 5, 2016 and the date of his separation.

# COUNT I (VIOLATION OF THE FLSA—FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES) PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT SCHULSON COLLECTIVE

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the above paragraphs as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 29. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee of Defendant Schulson Collective who typically and regularly worked more than an ordinary forty-hour workweek schedule.
- 30. Defendant Schulson Collective willfully and unlawfully failed to compensate Plaintiff in an amount equal to one and a half times his regular rate of pay for any and all hours that he worked in excess of his regular forty-hour workweek during one or more of those weeks.
- 31. Defendant Schulson Collective knew that its policies, practices and procedures regarding Plaintiff's uncompensated overtime work violated the FLSA and thus, Defendant Schulson Collective acted voluntary, deliberately, and with reckless disregard to Plaintiff's rights under the FLSA.
- 32. Defendant Schulson Collective did not act in good faith when failing to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation, nor did Defendant Schulson Collective have reasonable grounds to believe that their failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime complied with the FLSA.
- 33. As a result of Defendant Schulson Collective's violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer those damages and losses set forth herein.

34. As a further result of Defendant Schulson Collective's violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff is entitled to receive the amount of overtime compensation he is due, back pay, front pay, liquidated damages, attorney's fees, court costs, and prejudgment interest.

### COUNT II (VIOLATION OF THE FLSA—FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES) PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT SCHULSON

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the above paragraphs as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 36. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee of Defendant Schulson who typically and regularly worked more than an ordinary forty-hour workweek schedule.
- 37. Defendant Schulson had oversight and discretion with regards to the payment of Plaintiff's wages, including overtime compensation, and made decisions concerning Defendant Schulson Collective's day-to-day operations, hiring, firing, promotions, personnel matters, work schedules, pay policies, and compensation.
- 38. Defendant Schulson directly or indirectly, directed, aided, abetted, and/or assisted with the creation and/or execution of policies or practices of Defendant Schulson Collective, which resulted in the failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation.
- 39. Defendant Schulson willfully and unlawfully failed to compensate Plaintiff in an amount equal to one and a half times his regular rate of pay for any and all hours that he worked in excess of his regular forty-hour workweek during one or more of those weeks.
- 40. Defendant Schulson knew that its policies, practices and procedures regarding Plaintiff's uncompensated overtime work violated the FLSA and thus, Defendant Schulson acted voluntary, deliberately, and with reckless disregard to Plaintiff's rights under the FLSA.

- 41. Defendant Schulson did not act in good faith when failing to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation, nor did Defendant Schulson have reasonable grounds to believe that their failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime complied with the FLSA.
- 42. As a result of Defendant Schulson's violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer those damages and losses set forth herein.
- 43. As a further result of Defendant Schulson's violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff is entitled to receive the amount of overtime compensation he is due, back pay, front pay, liquidated damages, attorney's fees, court costs, and prejudgment interest.

# COUNT III (VIOLATION OF THE PMWA—FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES) PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT SCHULSON COLLECTIVE

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the above paragraphs as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 45. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee of Defendant Schulson Collective who typically and regularly more than an ordinary forty-hour workweek schedule.
- 46. Defendant Schulson Collective willfully and unlawfully failed to compensate Plaintiff in an amount equal to one and a half times his regular rate of pay for any and all hours that he worked in excess of his regular forty-hour workweek during one or more of those weeks.
- 47. Defendant Schulson Collective knew that its policies, practices and procedures regarding Plaintiff's uncompensated overtime work violated the PMWA and thus, Defendant Schulson Collective acted voluntary, deliberately and with reckless disregard to Plaintiffs rights under the PMWA.

- 48. Defendant Schulson Collective did not act in good faith when failing to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation, nor did Defendant Schulson Collective have reasonable grounds to believe that their failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime complied with the PMWA.
- 49. As a result of Defendant Schulson Collective's violations of the PMWA, Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer those damages and losses set forth herein.
- 50. As a further result of Defendant Schulson Collective's violations of the PMWA, Plaintiff is entitled to receive the amount of overtime compensation he is due, back pay, front pay, attorney's fees, court costs, and prejudgment interest.

# COUNT IV (VIOLATION OF THE PMWA—FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES) PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT SCHULSON

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference the above paragraphs as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 52. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee of Defendant Schulson who typically and regularly more than an ordinary forty-hour workweek schedule.
- 53. Defendant Schulson had oversight and discretion with regards to the payment of Plaintiff's wages, including overtime compensation, and made decisions concerning Defendant Schulson Collective's day-to-day operations, hiring, firing, promotions, personnel matters, work schedules, pay policies, and compensation.
- 54. Defendant Schulson directly or indirectly, directed, aided, abetted, and/or assisted with the creation and/or execution of policies or practices of Defendant Schulson Collective, which resulted in the failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation.

- 55. Defendant Schulson willfully and unlawfully failed to compensate Plaintiff in an amount equal to one and a half times his regular rate of pay for any and all hours that he worked in excess of his regular forty-hour workweek during one or more of those weeks.
- 56. Defendant Schulson knew that its policies, practices and procedures regarding Plaintiff's uncompensated overtime work violated the PMWA and thus, Defendant Schulson acted voluntary, deliberately and with reckless disregard to Plaintiffs rights under the PMWA.
- 57. Defendant Schulson did not act in good faith when failing to pay Plaintiff proper overtime compensation, nor did Defendant Schulson have reasonable grounds to believe that their failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime complied with the PMWA.
- 58. As a result of Defendant Schulson's violations of the PMWA, Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer those damages and losses set forth herein.
- 59. As a further result of Defendant Schulson's violations of the PMWA, Plaintiff is entitled to receive the amount of overtime compensation he is due, back pay, front pay, attorney's fees, court costs, and prejudgment interest.

### COUNT IV (UNJUST ENRICHMENT) PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT SCHULSON COLLECTIVE

- 60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs the above paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth in their entirety.
- 61. Plaintiff conferred a benefit on Defendant Schulson Collective by providing labor and services to Defendant Schulson Collective on a weekly-basis, including, but not limited to, labor and services rendered in excess of Plaintiff's regular forty-hour workweek.

- 62. Defendant Schulson Collective not only appreciated Plaintiff's benefit, but Defendant Schulson Collective required Plaintiff to work in excess of his regular forty-hour workweek.
- 63. Thus, it would be inequitable for Defendant Schulson Collective to retain the benefit of Plaintiff's overtime work without paying the value of the benefit, as mandated under the FLSA and PMWA.
- 64. Under the doctrine of unjust enrichment, Plaintiff is entitled to receive the amount of overtime compensation he is due, and any other equitable remedy that the Court deems necessary and just.

#### RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks damages and legal and equitable relief in connection with Defendants' unlawful conduct, and specifically prays that the Court grant the following relief to the Plaintiff by:

- (a) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the FLSA;
- (b) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PMWA;
- (c) enjoining and permanently restraining the violations alleged herein;
- (d) entering judgment against Defendants and in favor of the Plaintiff in an amount to be determined;
- (e) entering judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, to compensate, reimburse, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits he

would have received but-for Defendants' illegal action, including, but not limited to, back and front pay, and prejudgment interest;

- (f) awarding liquidated damages to Plaintiff under the FLSA;
- (g) awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under the FLSA, the PMWA, and Pennsylvania common law;
- (h) awarding Plaintiff the costs of suit, expert fees and other disbursements, and reasonable attorney's fees; and,
- (i) granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, proper, or equitable including other equitable and injunctive relief providing restitution for past violations and preventing future violations.

CONSOLE MATTIACCI LAW, LLC

FERNANDO I. RIVERA, ESQ. 1525 Locust Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102 rivera@consolelaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: June 19, 2019